

holders nationwide over a 3-year period. This rule was carefully developed and thoroughly considered.

Furthermore, it is important that tax payers understand that this is also a cost-savings rule, mitigating the over \$330 million worth of natural gas wasted every year as a result of flaring, venting, and leaking.

Ultimately, repealing the Methane Waste Rule would undermine the health, well-being, and economic prosperity of the American public and do nothing to combat the growing concern of climate change. I strongly urge my colleagues to reject H.J. Res 36. Any effort to undermine this important health, economic, and environmental protection results in a lose-lose situation for the American public and I oppose it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of the joint resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 191, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—221

Abraham	Chaffetz	Gaetz
Aderholt	Cheney	Gallagher
Allen	Coffman	Garrett
Amodei	Cole	Gibbs
Amodei	Collins (GA)	Gohmert
Arrington	Collins (NY)	Goodlatte
Babin	Comer	Gowdy
Bacon	Comstock	Granger
Banks (IN)	Conaway	Graves (GA)
Barletta	Cook	Graves (LA)
Barr	Costa	Graves (MO)
Barton	Cramer	Griffith
Bergman	Crawford	Grothman
Biggs	Cuellar	Guthrie
Bilirakis	Culberson	Harper
Bishop (MI)	Davidson	Harris
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Rodney	Hartzler
Black	Denham	Hensarling
Blackburn	Dent	Herrera Beutler
Blum	DeSantis	Hice, Jody B.
Bost	DesJarlais	Higgins (LA)
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Hill
Brat	Donovan	Holding
Bridenstine	Duffy	Hollingsworth
Brooks (AL)	Duncan (SC)	Hudson
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (TN)	Huizenga
Buchanan	Dunn	Hultgren
Buck	Emmer	Hunter
Bucshon	Farenthold	Hurd
Budd	Ferguson	Issa
Burgess	Fleischmann	Jenkins (KS)
Byrne	Flores	Jenkins (WV)
Calvert	Fortenberry	Johnson (LA)
Carter (GA)	Fox	Johnson (OH)
Carter (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Johnson, Sam
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	Jordan

Joyce (OH)	Murphy (PA)	Simpson
Kelly (MS)	Newhouse	Smith (MO)
Kelly (PA)	Noem	Smith (NE)
King (IA)	Olson	Smith (NJ)
King (NY)	Palazzo	Smith (TX)
Kinzinger	Palmer	Smucker
Knight	Paulsen	Stewart
Kustoff (TN)	Pearce	Stivers
LaHood	Perry	Taylor
LaMalfa	Peterson	Tenney
Lamborn	Pittenger	Thompson (PA)
Lance	Poe (TX)	Thornberry
Latta	Poliquin	Tiberi
Lewis (MN)	Posey	Tipton
LoBiondo	Ratcliffe	Trott
Long	Renacci	Turner
Loudermilk	Rice (SC)	Upton
Love	Roby	Valadao
Lucas	Roe (TN)	Wagner
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (AL)	Walberg
MacArthur	Rogers (KY)	Walden
Marchant	Rohrabacher	Walorski
Marino	Rokita	Walters, Mimi
Marshall	Rooney, Francis	Weber (TX)
Massie	Rooney, Thomas	Webster (FL)
McCarthy	J.	Wenstrup
McCaul	Roskam	Westerman
McClintock	Ross	Williams
McHenry	Rothfus	Wilson (SC)
McKinley	Rouzer	Wittman
McMorris	Royce (CA)	Womack
Rodgers	Russell	Woodall
McSally	Rutherford	Yoder
Meadows	Schweikert	Yoho
Messer	Scott, Austin	Young (AK)
Mitchell	Sensenbrenner	Young (IA)
Moolenaar	Sessions	Zeldin
Mooney (WV)	Shimkus	
Mullin	Shuster	

NAYS—191

Adams	Foster	McEachin
Aguilar	Frankel (FL)	McGovern
Barragan	Fudge	McNerney
Bass	Gabbard	Meehan
Beatty	Gallego	Meeks
Bera	Garamendi	Meng
Beyer	Gonzalez (TX)	Moore
Bishop (GA)	Gottheimer	Moulton
Blumenauer	Green, Al	Murphy (FL)
Blunt Rochester	Green, Gene	Nadler
Bonamici	Grijalva	Napolitano
Boyle, Brendan	Gutiérrez	Neal
F.	Hanabusa	Nolan
Brady (PA)	Heck	Norcross
Brown (MD)	Higgins (NY)	O'Halleran
Brownley (CA)	Himes	O'Rourke
Bustos	Hoyer	Pallone
Butterfield	Huffman	Panetta
Capuano	Jayapal	Pascarell
Carbajal	Jeffries	Payne
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Pelosi
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Perlmutter
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Peters
Chu, Judy	Katko	Pingree
Cicilline	Keating	Pocan
Cleaver	Kelly (IL)	Polis
Clyburn	Kennedy	Price (NC)
Cohen	Khanna	Quigley
Connolly	Kihuen	Raskin
Conyers	Kildee	Reichert
Cooper	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
Correa	Kind	Richmond
Costello (PA)	Krishnamoorthi	Ros-Lehtinen
Courtney	Kuster (NH)	Rosen
Crist	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Curbelo (FL)	Lawrence	Ryan (OH)
Davis (CA)	Lawson (FL)	Sánchez
Davis, Danny	Lee	Sanford
DeFazio	Levin	Sarbanes
DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
Delaney	Lieu, Ted	Schiff
DeLauro	Lipinski	Schneider
DelBene	Loebbeck	Schrader
Demings	Lofgren	Scott (VA)
DeSaulnier	Lowenthal	Scott, David
Deutch	Lowey	Serrano
Dingell	Lujan Grisham,	Sewell (AL)
Doggett	M.	Shea-Porter
Doyle, Michael	Luján, Ben Ray	Sherman
F.	Lynch	Sinema
Ellison	Maloney,	Sires
Eshoo	Carolyn B.	Slaughter
Españolat	Maloney, Sean	Smith (WA)
Esty	Mast	Soto
Faso	Matsui	Speier
Fitzpatrick	McCollum	Stefanik

Suozi	Tsongas	Wasserman
Swalwell (CA)	Vargas	Schultz
Takano	Veasey	Waters, Maxine
Thompson (CA)	Vela	Watson Coleman
Thompson (MS)	Velázquez	Welch
Titus	Visclosky	Wilson (FL)
Tonko	Walz	Yarmuth
Torres		

NOT VOTING—20

Carson (IN)	Gosar	Price, Tom (GA)
Castor (FL)	Hastings	Reed
Clark (MA)	Jackson Lee	Rush
Clarke (NY)	Jones	Scalise
Clay	Labrador	Walker
Engel	Mulvaney	Zinke
Evans	Nunes	

□ 1034

Messrs. MAST, BLUMENAUER, and MEEHAN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader and my friend, for the purposes of inquiring of the schedule for the week to come.

(Mr. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected during the evening hours on Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business today.

Mr. Speaker, the House will also continue our work under the Congressional Review Act to undo onerous Obama administration regulations through three more joint resolutions. The first, sponsored by Representative BRETT GUTHRIE, will stop a rule that significantly expands the Federal Government's involvement in teacher education.

□ 1045

Without our action this could result in fewer teachers serving some of our

Nation's most vulnerable children, and it could make it harder for schools to recruit the best teachers. That is the exact opposite of what Americans want for their children.

The second, sponsored by Representative TODD ROKITA, would address how the accountability provisions of the Every Student Succeeds Act are being implemented. This bipartisan law empowered States to hold schools accountable, but somehow, when the regulation came out, there was an expanded Federal role. This was not what Congress intended nor what is best for our students.

And the third, Mr. Speaker, sponsored by Representative LIZ CHENEY, addresses how the Department of the Interior regulates resource management plans. These plans guide how BLM manages all Federal lands. But the rule only addresses how BLM must deal with the public, as well as State and tribal governments. We are rightfully concerned that there is no process or procedure for local governments in these new rules.

Finally, my friend may notice that a familiar face is not sitting next to me today, but Ben Howard is up in the gallery today. After serving 8 years on Capitol Hill, the last 6 in my office, our friend Ben has left the job. He is now working in the White House Office of Legislative Affairs.

Ben was one of the first people we hired when I was elected majority whip. It was here that most people around the Hill got to know Ben through his always witty floor updates and always constant Penn State football commentary. When I was elected majority leader, I asked Ben to be the floor director, a position in which he has served well for the past 2-plus years.

My friend would be happy to know that Ben is from Maryland. He was born and raised and currently resides in Olney with his wife, Amy, and their two young sons, John and Daniel.

So on behalf of myself, our entire team, and the entire Republican Conference, I want to thank Ben for his years of service and for his hard work, and wish him many years of happiness.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the schedule of regulations to come. I am sure we will have some discussions about that next week. In fact, we are going to have some discussions about all of these regulations which we believe reduce the protections, according to the American people, by a number of the regulations that are sought to be repealed.

However, first, Mr. Speaker, let me note that, first of all, we have another Ben in Maryland. He is the senior Senator, a former colleague of ours, BEN CARDIN. He had a TV ad which ended with "My Friend, Ben."

I want to say hi to my friend Ben, who has—indeed, as all of you know, I think the staff that serve with us make such an extraordinarily positive difference, and they sometimes—or most

of the time—rise above what might be the partisan confrontation that Members have and continue to try to reach consensus so that this institution will run positively and well for the American people. Ben Howard has been one of those people.

I know that Shuwanza Goff, who sits next to me and is my floor director, has worked very positively with Ben through the years and appreciates very much his working with us. Kelly also falls into that category.

But Ben, we are going to miss you. I am sure that wherever you go, you are going to advantage the enterprise that you associate with. Olney, Maryland, is one of our thriving communities in Maryland. We are always proud of our Marylanders, and they always do a good job.

So I will say to him, Godspeed. I don't want to wish Penn State a lot of success, but, nevertheless, I do want to wish you a lot of success, Ben. Thank you very much for your service.

Now let me move on to, perhaps, some subjects that we might not have as much agreement on as we do have on Ben Howard and his quality and the service he has given this institution.

One of the first acts of Congress, of course, as you know, Mr. Leader, which was the plan, was to begin the reconciliation process to repeal the Affordable Care Act. The budget resolution set a deadline of January 27 for committees to report legislation repealing the law. It is now the 3rd of February, and after voting 65 times to repeal the ACA, House and Senate Republicans, Mr. Speaker, do not have, as far as I know, and don't appear to have, a replacement and are, as I read in the papers, Mr. Speaker, divided on the path forward.

Repealing the ACA without replacing it immediately will not only cause 30 million Americans to lose their coverage, but it would increase the cost for tens of millions more and would, I suggest, disadvantage everybody who has insurance, and clearly those who do not and would not have access.

MARK MEADOWS, who chairs the House Freedom Caucus, said: "We need to slow down the process so we can understand a little bit more the specifics and the timetable of replacement votes and reconciliation instructions. . . ."

That was in Politico on January 9 of this year.

Senator BOB CORKER, in the Senate, said: "There's more and more concerns about not doing" repeal and replace "simultaneously. You would think after 6 years, we would have a pretty good sense of what we would like to do."

We have not seen a repeal and replace bill. The President said it ought to be done contemporaneously. BOB CORKER and others have said it ought to be done contemporaneously. We haven't seen it. So my question, Mr. Majority Leader, is: Does the gentleman expect that if repeal does move forward, that a replacement bill would be considered simultaneously?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am not sure if, in the beginning of your question, you want us to speed up or slow down, but I thank the gentleman for the question.

Mr. HOYER. I can clarify that for the gentleman.

Mr. McCARTHY. I heard your question. Your question asked it both ways.

Regardless of who won the election, the simple fact is ObamaCare is a failure. Regardless of who won the election, we would both be sitting here today having the same conversation about what we would replace it with.

Let's just simply talk about the facts.

There were 23 co-ops created in ObamaCare. They were given \$2 billion. As of today, 18 of them have failed. There are roughly a little more than 3,000 counties in America; 1,022 of those counties, roughly one-third, now only have one insurance company. Five States only have one insurance company, thanks to ObamaCare.

All of America knows the old quotes: if you like your health plan, you can keep it—we know that is no longer true—or if you like your doctor, you can keep it—that is no longer true.

When the President said that our premiums would go down by \$2,500, now we know that is not true. So, yes, we would have this discussion regardless of who won this election. ObamaCare has failed.

So, yes, we are going to work together, just as, after the last election, I put a letter out to every Governor, Republican or Democrat, every insurance commissioner, Republican or Democrat, to provide us with their ideas. We welcome every idea on the other side of the aisle, too, because we will do this differently. We welcome your ideas as well.

If you noticed in the Energy and Commerce Committee, they have the hearing schedule. We will begin, and it will be an open process. We welcome your participation because we want a system that works, we do not want a system that has failed, and I believe we have the ideas to make it work correctly.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

We are not in agreement, Mr. Speaker. What we will be doing would be 180 degrees different. We would not be pretending that we are going to repeal an Affordable Care Act that has been a success.

We do not agree, Mr. Speaker, that having 30 million Americans insured that were not insured before the Affordable Care Act is a failure. We do not agree that people with preexisting conditions who can now get insurance is a failure. We do not agree that people who are 26 or younger being on their family's policy when they don't have a job or alternative insurance is a failure. We do not agree that Americans having the security that their insurance will not be canceled because

they reached an annual limit is a failure. We do not agree that Americans having no lifetime limit so that if they have a catastrophic illness they will still have coverage—that is not a failure.

What is a failure is to have pretended for the last 6 years that they wanted to repeal the Affordable Care Act and have no replacement as of this time. That was a failure.

The President says, Mr. Speaker, that his plan is going to make sure that everybody is insured, comprehensive coverage, and that costs will come down. He, of course, Mr. Speaker, has now offered a bill to effect that objective. We would welcome such a bill so that we can consider it.

No, Mr. Speaker, had the 3 million additional people who voted for Hillary Clinton more so than voted for Donald Trump prevailed—the Electoral College prevailed, but the majority of the American people that voted, the plurality, voted for policies to keep the Affordable Care Act as Mrs. Clinton said she would do if she were elected.

So, Mr. Speaker, the majority leader is in deep error on we would be having the same debate. But he is right; we had an outcome of a party and a President who said they were going to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

GOP Conference Chair CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS stated: “Let me be clear: no one who has coverage because of ObamaCare today will lose that coverage.”

The majority leader said something about the President saying, if you like your policy, you can keep it. In fact, the President was substantially right on that. Yes. Were there minimum coverages so that people weren't scammed by insurance companies saying you got insurance, but, oh, by the way, we don't cover that, by the way, we don't cover that? Have you seen those ads about, I bought a new car and I had a wreck a day later and, guess what, the insurance company wants to give me 80 percent, 90 percent, 70 percent less? That is what the insurance companies were doing. People thought they had insurance for something, and they didn't have it.

So CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS says you are not going to lose anything. Well, I don't know. If it was so bad, why don't you repeal it? Why don't you offer a bill to repeal it and to undermine all those factors of the Affordable Care Act that are now available to the Americans that I suggested?

President Trump—I said this, but I want to repeat it—said last month that Republicans were nearing completion of an ACA replacement that would provide insurance for everybody. Bring it on. Bring it on. Insurance for everybody. Let's see it.

He went on to say his plan would have lower numbers, much lower deductibles. God bless him. Bring it on. Let us see it. Let's vote on it. It is not on the floor, and I am not sure when it will be on the floor, but perhaps the majority leader could tell us.

My question to you is: When do you expect such a bill consistent with the President's representation to the American people of everybody having insurance and at lower cost and lower deductibles? When do we expect a bill like that on the floor?

I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Since ObamaCare has passed and now that we know what was in it, you would know that there are 1,400 pages in there that give a great deal, amount of power to the Secretary of Health and Human Services. Unfortunately, today, that Secretary has not been confirmed.

That Secretary has not been confirmed simply because of politics. It is not on my side of the aisle. It is on the Democrats' side of the aisle over in the Senate.

□ 1100

Do you know how far they have gone? How much do they really want to work on health care when you actually said it needed to be reformed? They wouldn't even show up in committee. So how much do they really care about Americans? They don't even show up in committee to ask the questions. They wanted to run and hide. So how much do they really want to work?

If we want to go quote by quote, when we go back to what President Obama said when the premiums were going to lower by \$2,500, what do we say to Arizona when they went up 116 percent or to Tennessee by 63 percent and then three-quarters of Tennessee counties only have one provider or to Minnesota by 59 percent or to Oklahoma by 59 percent or to Alabama, 58, or to Pennsylvania, 53, or to Nebraska, 51?

Can we stop this rhetoric, and can we now get to work? Because I will tell you this: next month is when we begin because I am hopeful that we will no longer put up with the political games on the Senate side and that we will confirm the new Secretary because you have to have a Secretary in place if you want to reform ObamaCare, because you gave so much power to the Secretary. We all know that. So let's work together on behalf of the American people and end this pain.

I will tell you this: the unfortunate reality, in today's system, is that coverage does not always mean care. The deductibles are so high that many people don't even go to their doctors. I can tell you that in States, prior to ObamaCare, their high-risk pools were cheaper than for their care than now in just buying ObamaCare. We all know it is a failure. So let's stop playing the political games, and let's put the people before politics, and let's put a system in that works. Our door is open, and the committee is open for all ideas. Let's work together to solve it.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the majority leader for his comments.

I don't think he wants me to delve very deeply into why we do not have a

Secretary of Health and Human Services. It is because the Republicans have not produced nor has the nominee produced full disclosure, as the gentleman knows, of his financial dealings with respect to legislation that he introduced and supported. They want full information so that they can make a considered judgment. I won't go further into that deep well, however.

I will say to the gentleman that you don't need a Secretary to bring legislation to the floor, and this is not an issue that is new this year or that is as a result of the November election of last year. It is, frankly, after 65 votes on this floor, to repeal the Affordable Care Act without having an alternative.

I will tell my friend, the majority leader, with great respect, you have had 6 years. You can catalog all of the things that you think are bad. Obviously, you don't mention any of the things that are good except so many in your caucus—perhaps the overwhelming majority of the caucus—say we are going to keep preexisting conditions, and we are going to keep 26. Of course, we are not going to eliminate annual limits, because that will hurt people and force them into bankruptcy. I don't hear that discussion going on. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Leader, you cannot get away from the fact that 6 years have gone by since we adopted the Affordable Care Act—6 years of complaining about how awful it is.

By the way, as the gentleman knows, the majority of people now have made it very clear they do not want to repeal the Affordable Care Act unless they see a replacement on the table that they can consider and look to for alternatives. And that, as you know, Mr. Leader, is the first time in the 6 years because people said, “yes, we don't like the Affordable Care Act” in a vacuum, but now, when it really may be repealed, they are looking at it much more closely, and they don't know what is going to replace it, and they are concerned.

I have, I will tell you, family after family after family—I had somebody come up to me in the grocery store two nights ago, at Harris Teeter—with tears in his eyes—who said: Don't let them repeal the Affordable Care Act. I have a son who has a dire illness; and but for the fact of the Affordable Care Act, he would not be covered, and we couldn't keep him alive—with tears in his eyes.

So, when I hear you cataloging some of the things, those cases aren't mentioned. The 30 million aren't mentioned. The preexisting condition isn't mentioned.

I will say to my friend that you don't need a Secretary of Health and Human Services to bring a bill forward.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Yes, you do.

Mr. HOYER. Going to go to another subject, Mr. Leader, obviously, we are very concerned about the Affordable Care Act, but we are also very concerned—as we talked about executive

orders on this refugee ban that were issued, according to almost everybody, without much consultation with anybody other than within the White House—of an order banning Muslim refugees from coming into this country even after very strong vetting.

I know that the position is, oh, this is not a ban. The complication you have to that representation is the President keeps mentioning it as a ban, as he said he was going to do in the election, and he referred to it as a ban just a few days ago. But I would point out to you, Mr. Leader—and I am sure you know this—not a single terrorist act—not one—has been perpetrated by a refugee coming into this country from any one of the seven nations mentioned in the ban. We believe this is not only contrary to the Constitution but that it is contrary to our principles.

Let me make it clear, Mr. Leader, so that there is no confusion: nobody on this side of the aisle doesn't want to make America's borders secure, America's land and assets safe, and the American people safe. Every one of us on this side of the aisle wants to make sure that that happens, and we certainly want to make sure that the vetting is appropriate. As the majority leader knows, the vetting today is a very long and very careful process. We believe this ban alienates our allies and emboldens terrorists who are now saying: See, this really is a war on Islam.

That will not be consistent with the safety of our men and women whom we have at the point of the spear and will not be consistent to the safety and security of our allies in the Middle East.

Senators MCCAIN and GRAHAM have said exactly that.

They pointed out:

"Our government has a responsibility to defend our borders, but we must do so in a way that makes us safer and upholds all that is decent and exceptional about our nation." This is JOHN MCCAIN and LINDSEY GRAHAM. "It is clear from the confusion at our airports across the nation that President Trump's executive order was not properly vetted." Senator GRAHAM and Senator MCCAIN, chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the gentleman from South Carolina.

They go on:

"We are particularly concerned by reports that this order went into effect with little to no consultation with the Departments of State, Defense, Justice, and Homeland Security. Such a hasty process risks harmful results." This continues to be a quote by Senator MCCAIN and Senator GRAHAM. "Ultimately, we fear this executive order will become a self-inflicted wound in the fight against terrorism." Senator MCCAIN knows something about increased risk.

He went on to say, along with Senator GRAHAM:

"This executive order sends a signal, intended or not, that America does not

want Muslims coming into our country. That is why we fear this executive order may do more to help terrorist recruitment than improve our security." They said that on the 29th of January, just 4 days ago.

At least four times this week, Mr. Leader, we asked for the consideration of H.R. 724, which rescinds and defunds the refugee ban. The Speaker said, when he took office initially—and he repeated this year—that we were going to have an open, transparent process and that we would consider the important issues of the day on this floor, with an opportunity for every Member of this House to offer alternatives.

I know the committee would not report it out, but this is a critical issue to our country, to our safety, and to our values; and I ask the gentleman:

Is there a possibility that you would bring to the floor next week or the week thereafter—preferably next week—H.R. 724 so that the Members of this House—the people's Representatives—could speak to this critically important issue consistent with the observations of Senator MCCAIN and Senator GRAHAM?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I listened to the Speaker when he took office, too, and he also said "regular order." In the schedule for next week, it is not on the list.

The executive order signed by the President, really, as you know, is based on legislation that passed this House with overwhelming bipartisan support. It was following the attacks over the past 2 years. It was the SAFE Act that passed this House 289–137, and the Visa Waiver Program Improvement and Terrorist Travel Prevention Act that passed by 407–19. I will point out that these two bills received veto-proof majorities, and President Obama signed the visa waiver bill into law.

President Trump's actions are temporary pauses and reassess our vetting procedures to keep our country safe. While there was, certainly, some confusion with how this was implemented over the weekend, the Secretary of Homeland Security is effectively addressing key issues to ensure legal permanent residents who are returning to our country are allowed entry unless our security services have a compelling reason to suggest otherwise. America remains a place of refuge for those seeking peace, freedom, and opportunity across the world.

Now, my friend knows, because we have been in meetings this week, that our rhetoric matters. Other people listen to what we say. In these types of situations, especially with a new administration, I have always told my children: at any time in a situation, let's take a deep breath; let's not lose our heads. Especially with a brand new administration, I try to give them the benefit of the doubt. They don't have their Cabinet there yet. Let's let them get their footing. It is not a ban—it is

a pause. It is based upon two pieces of legislation that passed this House.

You love to quote people; so if I may: "House Democrats and House Republicans have no greater priority than keeping Americans safe. This is neither a partisan issue nor is it a partisan difference. Many Americans are frustrated with the pace of progress against ISIS in Iraq and Syria. I want to see the administration and Congress working together to protect our Nation. The reforms in this bill are an excellent start."

"This legislation will make it easier for law enforcement to vet those visitors who are coming from Visa Waiver countries, such as in Europe, to ensure that we are not admitting those who have traveled to places like Iraq and Syria and link up with ISIS."

That was said by you.

Mr. HOYER. I think that is an excellent quote, which I still agree with.

Mr. MCCARTHY. So you know the importance.

What I would say to the gentleman is: let's work with this administration.

As we sat in our meeting this week with leaders of other countries, I thought their advice to us was good advice: let's not say what this is not, because we may get political points with one another, but it puts them in harm's way, and they know what the truth of this is.

I think you and I agree on a lot of different things, and we are cordial with one another when we disagree, and I think this is an area in which sometimes we may disagree, but sometimes we have shown we could agree.

□ 1115

I know you want to keep America safe, and I know we want to keep America safe.

I also know it is a brand new administration. I also know that when I go down to that White House—you have been there with me—there is not a lot of staff there. I know there are going to be a few hiccups along the way. I am going to work with them. I am going to help them, and I want you to help us help them as well.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from California to do something?

The advice that the gentleman gives to his children about taking a breath, perhaps before they tweet—

Mr. MCCARTHY. My kids don't tweet.

Mr. HOYER. That is good advice as well.

Would you give that advice to the President of the United States and tell him to take a breath before he makes policy or before he offends our allies or before he creates great fear in those who hear what he has to say off the cuff?

Yes, I understand that rhetoric counts. You might talk to him about that as well. He is the one that calls this a ban. I know that everybody else is trying to clean it up, and I hope that

is the case. In fact, I have seen the head of Homeland Security, Secretary Kelly, trying to clean it up.

It is a darn shame that it wasn't cleaned up before. It was a darned shame that the time was not taken to do an order that would make sure that vetting was appropriate, as my quote and our legislation that you talked about urged.

It is good advice to your children and good advice to this President: Take a breath. Just don't, as immediately it comes to mind, tweet it and have the impact not known to you, your staff, or to the country.

Almost invariably, we have seen this has a negative effect.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, President Obama said that he was rooting for President Trump's success.

I would also give the advice, let's not root against him. He still doesn't have his own Cabinet. When I watched and listened to what some on the other side of their own leadership say about some there, I could see where the rhetoric continues to rise. I think we should put that down. The election is over, and now is the time to govern.

There are big problems out there. We can score as many political points as we want back and forth, but there are challenges. You and I have worked together on so many issues out here, from opioids, from the visa waiver so many different times. And we have disagreed others times.

I think it would behoove us and the American public that we can show the leadership to do that, and I look forward to working with you on these issues.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comment. I think we have demonstrated over the years that we ascribe to that concept.

My point to you is, in the first 10 or 12 days of this administration, that concept has been put at great risk. I think the gentleman's advice is good, and we have pursued that.

I simply urge the gentleman from California to suggest to the President of the United States that he adopt that concept as well.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, it is good to have these colloquies back.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2017, TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2017

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, February 6, 2017, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BERGMAN). Is there objection to the re-

quest of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### PAYING TRIBUTE TO GARY ANDRES

(Mr. UPTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a very good friend, certainly a trusted adviser and, by everyone's account, one of the very best staff directors ever on the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. Gary Andres.

I first met Gary when he was a young staffer working in the White House for President Bush 41. Over the years, I became so close with both Gary and his wonderful wife, Sue.

Gary came on board day one for my committee chairmanship, and we assembled an all-star staff of the most professional, talented, and kind people on Capitol Hill. In Gary, we got a trusted counselor with a strategic mind second to none. Gary also understands that sometimes you can't change the direction of the winds, but you can adjust your sails so that you are always going to reach that destination.

Nowhere was this more important than during our herculean, bipartisan 21st Century Cures Act effort. For more than 3 years, Gary was our five-star general; and thanks to his tireless leadership, we got the job done for patients and families across the country.

What drove us more than anything else was that the clock was ticking for folks with terrible diseases, and we couldn't waste a day to get this bipartisan bill to the President for him to sign into law. It ended up being what many say was the most significant legislation enacted in the 114th Congress.

But it went beyond the 21st Century Cures Act. There were 562 hearings, 354 measures through the House, 200 signed into law in the last 6 years, substantial legislative wins. Whether it be the doc fix, saving Medicare, pipeline safety, health reforms, opioids, so many more, Gary was with us at the table.

Gary understands how important this institution is. He has a reverence for the people's House. But Gary was also quick with a smile, a witty insight, or a laugh. He never lost his perspective, his temper, or eagerness to engage on an issue.

I know I speak for all of the Members and staff on both sides of the aisle when we say: Thank you, Gary. We are going to miss you, but we know that we are going to continue to lean on you for advice no matter what the issue is.

As Gary moves on to that next venture, I wish him the very best.

To his wonderful wife, Sue, who is in the gallery today, it has been an honor to work with this distinguished gentleman.

#### HONORING GARY ANDRES

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I second and reiterate what my colleague from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) just said about Gary Andres.

I actually remember, when I was first elected to Congress in 1988 and when the first President Bush was President, being outside of the Capitol, outside the House Chambers and talking to Gary. He was, I believe, the White House congressional liaison at the time.

I was a young Member and didn't really know what was going on around here with a Republican President; and Gary was so warm, so helpful, trying to help me out, even though I was of the other party, even though I was a freshman Member. And that continued on so many occasions, both under President Bush and, of course, afterwards and most recently, with the Energy and Commerce Committee as a staff director.

What Representative UPTON said is absolutely true, Gary was always the fighter for the Republicans, for the majority; but at the same time, he always wanted to work with Democrats.

Gary, like Congressman UPTON, believed very strongly that if we were going to accomplish anything, it had to be done on a bipartisan basis. I know Congressman UPTON mentioned in particular the 21st Century Cures Act, but it was true with everything.

One of the reasons that we were so successful, I think, in the last session in doing so many pieces of legislation that were important to the country was not only because of Congressman UPTON and his leadership, but also because of Gary and his working with Jeff Carroll, who is our minority staff director.

So I wish Gary well. There are very few people that I can say, over the last 29 years that I have been here, who was always trying to reach out and do the right thing. I think that is so important.

So congratulations and good luck in the future, Gary.

#### IN APPRECIATION OF GARY ANDRES

(Mr. WALDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, as the new chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I, too, want to join in showing my appreciation and affection for Gary. He has given our committee and, dare I say, our country incredible service for many years.

I am grateful for his friendship, I am grateful for his guidance, his counsel and, as we have gone through this transition, his advice, a steady hand, incredible intellect, a curiosity about how to get policy done.